

From: bobjeannegeorge@comcast.net [mailto:bobjeannegeorge@comcast.net]

Sent: Thursday, July 07, 2011 3:17 PM

To: Holstine, Craig; Krier, Bob

Subject: Fwd: McMillin Bridge - Alternatives Analysis

To All Interested Parties:

Although I haven't studied the Alternates Analysis in great detail, I think Alternate #4 is a very good solution. I'd suggest asking WSDOT to bring their cost estimates with them to the meeting. I suspect the estimate for their preferred alternate is shaved to the bone, while the estimate for Alternate #4 is well padded .

What would it cost for WSDOT to continue to perform inspections, and maintenance? With car traffic off the bridge, further structural damage would be very unlikely, and as stated in the report inspections could be made at 4-5 year intervals, instead of the normal 2 years. These inspections could be conducted by WSDOT as the Bridge Preservation crews inspect other bridges in the area. I can't imagine the added cost of this inspection to be more than a *Drop in the Bucket*. Any one who tells you differently, is "*Blowing Smoke*." Pierce County likely doesn't want the bridge because they don't want to have to inspect and maintain it. I think that objection goes out the window if WSDOT agrees to do that work. This would require a written Agreement between the County and the State.

A bridge like the McMillin Bridge only comes around once in a lifetime. In my opinion, WSDOT owes it to the State's historical heritage to find a way to save the bridge. I'm really disappointed that the State's history appears to have only minimal value in the eyes of WSDOT's engineers.

Feel free to share my comments at the July 13th meeting.

Oscar R. (Bob) George, Civil & Structural Engineer
Retired WSDOT Bridge Preservation Engineer